The Times-Dispatch
DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office..........916 E. Main Street
South Richmond..........1102 Hull Street
Petersburg Bureau......109 N. Sycamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau..........215 Eighth Street

BY MAIL. POSTAGE PAID.	One Year.	Six Mos.	Three Mos.	One Mo.
Daily with Sunday	$6.00	$3.00	$1.50	.55
Daily without Sunday	4.00	2.00	1.00	.35
Sunday edition only	2.00	1.00	.50	.25
Weekly (Wednesday)	1.00	.50	.25	...

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg—

	One Week.
Daily with Sunday	14 cents
Daily without Sunday	10 cents
Sunday only	5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1910.

ANOTHER CASE OF THE REPORTER.

Judge Baldwin persists in his purpose to bring that suit for slander. He told the Yale students who called to celebrate his victory the other night that he intended to teach his slanderer a little law; but we hope that he will abandon the role of the teacher in this case for the larger work of the statesman upon which he is about to enter, "by all his country's wishes blest." Undoubtedly, Judge Baldwin has a just grievance and a good case. The Associated Press reported that he had been maliciously and falsely assailed in a public speech, giving the words of the speaker. Judge Baldwin wrote a letter to the speaker, saying that he had been misrepresented, and politely requesting that his position on the question at issue be fairly stated, so that his reputation as a lawyer might not be damaged in the public mind. His letter was answered with a denial that the speaker's words had been correctly reported. Judge Baldwin obtained a stenographic report of the speech and found that the speech had been correctly reported. He renewed his request for a correction; but again it was refused and the original misrepresentation was persisted in: but not to the disadvantage of Judge Baldwin, as the election returns in Connecticut on Tuesday amply proved. In the circumstances, therefore, we think that Judge Baldwin might very well drop the threatened prosecution for slander. Upon reflection we believe that Judge Baldwin will take our good counsel—he requires no defence before the American people.

One of the interesting features of this case was the readiness with which the speaker, when caught in his tricks, blamed it on the reporter. That is often the way. The reporter here, we believe, was a sort of worshipper of the speaker who uttered the slander; at least, he had ears to hear, and what he heard he wrote into his account, without a thought, doubtless, that it was of such character as would make the speaker feel that he must get out of it in some way. The reporter was a man working for a salary and dependent upon his daily toil for his living and the support of those dependent upon him. He was not a politician; his instructions were to write what he heard, and having written it, he went to bed, probably very late at night, without the least thought that he had reported anything that would occasion any disturbance or involve his own highly prized reputation for accuracy into dispute. That the reporter wrote the truth has since been amply sustained by the letters of the person who tried to make a scapegoat of him.

If the men who address public assemblies would think about it for a moment they would not be so ready to escape whatever embarrassment they might feel by reason of their reported utterances by unloading on the reporters. As a rule, reporters are a very dependable lot; otherwise, they would not be able to hold their jobs for an hour. With the reporter in this case, the Associated Press and a large majority of the people of Connecticut on his side, we do not think that Judge Baldwin need worry himself about the slander uttered against him.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS.

The ideas of prison reform which have gained so much ground in the United States are yet almost unknown in other countries. The Director of Prisons in the Republic of France attended the recent international prison reform congress in Washington. Returning to his native land, he declared that he had been astonished by some of the features of the management of prisons in this country. Life in them, he said, is "the height of luxury for criminals." The prisoners he thought better lodged and fed than the majority of French workingmen. They had three good meals a day; they could read papers and take part in athletic games; they sit in rocking chairs, smoke, and read magazines. Moreover, they are given an education while they are incarcerated.

The reason which the director assigns for this leniency in prisons is the American esteem of personal liberty. He thinks that the American people believe that the deprivation of liberty is about enough punishment for a man. He believes that our kind treatment of prisoners makes for the increase of crime. This view we do not accede.

What the Director says, though, as to leniency exercised toward prisoners, is only partly true. Some institutions are more liberal and more advanced in their ideas than others. Perhaps a case in point illustrating the liberal method is that of the Massachusetts State prison, at Charlestown, where prisoners are allowed to furnish their cells—called in the prison, by the way, "Rooms." Rugs and easy chairs can be put in at their expense or that of their friends. They can subscribe for respectable magazines and newspapers. They can join one of the two prison baseball teams or the prison band. They can smoke, and each week they can buy fruit. They can go to school in the day, or take a correspondence school course, get a practical education, and thus fit themselves for life beyond prison walls when their terms are over. They can talk with fellow-prisoners.

This method has been in vogue at Charlestown for fifteen years. The result has been that the percentage of recommitments of discharged prisoners is less there than that at any similar institution in the United States. It was not disproportionate regard for personal liberty which caused the adoption of this method, but the conviction that prison hours might be so utilized as to reclaim the citizen and make a good and useful man of him when released. Silence, rigor and humiliation have been done away with wisely. In the reforming of prisoners by this method we have achieved, wherein France has failed.

GOT HIS EYE ON 1912.

Says the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, speaking through his great personal Catalogue, The Commoner, of the elections on Tuesday: "The Democrats have carried New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Ohio and Indiana. The result in a number of States is in doubt as The Commoner goes to press, but enough is certain to give the Democrats reason to hope for a Presidential victory in 1912, if the new Democratic Congress makes a good record. Let us hope that the Democratic members will appreciate their responsibility."

It should be noted, as showing in some sense the value of this statement, that not one of these States ever voted for Mr. Bryan. At the last election New York gave Mr. Taft a plurality of 119,715; New Jersey, 82,759; Massachusetts, 110,423; Ohio, 69,591, and Indiana, 10,731.

The only suggestion made by Mr. Bryan in expressing his view of the result on Tuesday is that the increased Democratic vote in the United States Senate, by combining with the Progressive Republicans, may make it probable that the Senate will submit a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. We suppose that further suggestions will be made later. Indeed, it is too much to hope that they will not be, but just at present the popular election of Senators is the only "paramount" in sight. There will be others, of course—lots of them, stacks of them, cowpens full of them—and the prospect is not altogether encouraging; but we are sure that we detect signs of renewed activity in what some persons have regarded as the extinct volcano in Nebraska.

Mr. Bryan's suggestion that the result "is certain to give the Democrats reason to hope for a Presidential victory in 1912" looks mighty suspicious to us, but, as we are already pledged up to 1920, inclusive, it does not materially affect any of the predictions we have made touching the recurrence of the Nebraska plague. Of course, Mr. Bryan's vote in the Dahlman matter will be urged by some of the rigidly righteous as a handicap, but not by his countrymen who have followed him three times to merited defeat, and who will demand that he shall again lead us forth to battle.

MUSTN'T GET TOO COCKY.

The Charlotte Evening Chronicle has not lost its head. It does not think that the elections on Tuesday mean that the Democratic party has the world in a sling. "If there are those who think that the Republican party in this State (North Carolina) will give up and quit," says the Chronicle, "they would do well to undeceive themselves. There will be a new alignment, a reorganization of the forces for the presidential year, and the fight will be even more vigorous than it was in the recent campaign." There is a great deal of common sense in that view.

One swallow does not make a summer; one election will not re-establish the Democratic party in control of this country. The fight for Constitutional Government must go on. It is a never ending struggle, and if we would win in 1912 we must prove by the record we shall make in the next two years at Washington, by our law making, and in the several States which swung over to the Democratic party on Tuesday, by the ability with which their affairs are administered, that the interests of the country may be left safely in our hands.

After fourteen or fifteen years of famine, we must not over-feed ourselves, when the grazing is good, lest we founder.

THE CASE SYSTEM IN PREACHING.

The greatest evangelist in the world to-day is Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman. Just at present he is conducting an evangelical campaign in Chicago, and the fruits of his labors there have been plenteous. The Chicago Record-Herald, in a story about him, says:

"One of the secrets of Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman's success as an evangelist lies in the number and aptness of his illustrations. Dr. Chapman does not preach doctrinal sermons. His exhortations consist largely of a connected series of short dramatic stories, which illumine the truths hidden in the Scripture text. In his White City exhortations Dr. Chapman rarely speaks for more than twenty minutes. Many times he talks less than fifteen minutes. Often he will recite dramatically as many as a dozen emotional and thrilling stories in the course of one short appeal. His fund of illustrations seems inexhaustible, and each, in its way, is a classic."

All those who have heard or read the sermons of this great leader in the evangelization of America know that this statement as to Dr. Chapman's method of speaking is absolutely correct. It is a far cry from the old-fashioned "discourse," almost devoid of illustration and word-picture, to that of Dr. Chapman, but the success which he has met demonstrates the efficiency and superiority of this method in dealing with the great mass of American citizenship.

In his preaching Dr. Chapman carries out what is known among students of law as the "case system," or deductive method of reasoning. Certain connected facts are given, and the reader or hearer makes his own deductions as to the moral or lesson involved. It is a method which quickens the ability to think straight and reach conviction quickly. We profess little knowledge of homiletics, but we believe that to the average mind this system is more effective than the old plan of sermon making. A bare, logical discourse, however eloquently voiced, is not as likely to carry conviction of reason as some simple and homely story, well told, from which the hearer can draw for himself the inevitable conclusion.

THE EGYPTIAN COTTON SCHEDULE.

The Egyptian cotton crop this year is said by Consul Birch to approximate 700,000,000 pounds, or 1,400,000 bales of 500 pounds each, that being the average weight of the American cotton bale. The crop last year aggregated 500,000,000 pounds, or 1,000,000 bales. The acreage devoted to the cultivation of cotton in Egypt has been steadily increasing, the acreage this year being 138,079 acres in excess of the acreage last year.

Of course, we are glad that new crops and new methods of farming are being introduced into Egypt, and that there appear to be improving conditions of living and working in the land of the Pharaohs which has lain fallow for so many generations of men. But can anybody tell us why the cotton grown in Egypt should be admitted to the United States free of duty? Why it should not at least be taxed to the extent of the difference in the cost of producing the Egyptian cotton and the cost of producing cotton in our own highly favored land? That is one of the principles laid down in the new tariff primers, and, of course, it can be explained to the satisfaction at least of those who buy the Egyptian staple for manufacturing purposes. This is one of the cases in which it is claimed that free raw materials can be brought into the United States without injury to any of the other established industries, a subject which we do not intend to discuss at this time. As the question of revising the tariff will be taken up for consideration by the new Democratic Congress, it would seem that the report of Consul Birch might be filed for the attention of the new tariff makers. Manifestly, cotton and woollen goods manufactured in the United States of cotton grown in Egypt should not have any advantage of cotton goods manufactured in England and Germany and France and in other foreign countries of cotton grown in the United States; at least that appears to be a logical application of the great principle of trade reciprocity.

We would not have Egyptian cotton imported into the United States taxed. We would encourage in every fair way its use by our mills; but at the same time we would have the law changed so that cotton fabrics, manufactured from American-grown cotton in foreign countries should be admitted to the United States free of duty. That that would be a fair exchange nobody could question, and all for the benefit of the consumer who must wear cotton clothing, and of the American manufacturer who has found the Egyptian cotton so well adapted to the requirements of his trade.

"SOME PUMPKINS" FOR MASSACHUSETTS.

Massachusetts claims a new world record in corn production. The judges of the New England Corn Exposition, at Worcester, have awarded the distinction for having achieved this new record, and a prize of $500 to Perley G. Davis, of Granby, in that State. Now listen to this new record:

Mr. Davis harvested from one acre of land 103 1-4 bushels of crib-dry yellow flint corn. At the time the corn was harvested it made 127 bushels of shelled grain, which was reduced to an equal of 103 1-4 bushels on a scientific basis. Think of that! Wonderful, isn't it? And wonderful it is, truly, that there is an acre of land in Massachusetts that would yield 100 bushels of anything except trouble for the rest of the country. But let us keep down to our subject.

Dozens of records, hundreds of records, we should say, have beaten this Massachusetts record. Years ago Zeke Drake, of Marlboro county, South Carolina, produced on one acre of land—poor land at that, a sandy loom that was regarded as being so poor before the War that it was not planted at all—255 bushels and three pecks of corn, and received a prize of $1,000 from the Orange Judd Company for this performance. That was a record, indeed, and it has never been beaten in the history of the world, so far as we know. But it is not the only record that has been made. The Columbia State, received yesterday, contained a very interesting account of how Jerry H. Moore, age fifteen years, of Winona, in Florence County, South Carolina, produced this year on one acre of land 228 bushels and three pecks of corn. The statement is accompanied by affidavits. Jerry Moore is a son of a minister of the Gospel, and his feat is certified to by Ira W. Williams, State Agent of the United States Farm Demonstration Work, and A. H. Gasque, County Superintendent of Education in Florence County. The cost of making this crop was $128.05, and the net profit was $130.70.

Some very remarkable records have been made in other Southern States, and notably in the State of Virginia. The largest yield of corn to the acre in this State, according to the figures obtained yesterday from the State Department of Agriculture, was 167 7-9 bushels. This crop was produced by Morris Alders on one acre of land in Dinwiddie County. An almost equally good record was made by James Bellwood, of Chesterfield County, who produced 160 bushels of corn to the acre.

These records could be almost indefinitely extended, but we must say that Perley G. Davis, of Granby, Massachusetts, was making a good deal of corn when he produced more than 100 bushels on an acre of land in that Commonwealth. Mr. Davis would probably do well in the South where every prospect pleases, and where lands are so fertile naturally, or so well adapted to scientific farming, that it is difficult in good seasons for them to hold all the corn that they can grow. One hundred and three bushels of corn to the acre, indeed! There are acres and acres of land in Virginia which, with anything like scientific treatment, would yield, at the least, twice that many bushels. But we must say again that this is a great record for Massachusetts.

CHILDREN ON THE FARM.

Last week the children of W. D. Blackwell, of Inman, S. C., performed several notable feats in picking cotton. On one day his family, consisting of eight children, and himself—he worked only half a day—picked 2,503 pounds of cotton. On another day, with this regiment reinforced by another daughter and three very small children, they picked 2,295 pounds. The oldest of the children was twenty years, a boy, who picked the first trial day 356 pounds, and on the second day a little more than 400 pounds. We do not know the age of the "three very small children" who were said to have helped in the picking the second day, but it is known that three of the children were under fourteen years of age. Doubtless they enjoyed their work; at least, they went at it as if it were a picnic.

This incident is noted for the purpose of inquiring why it is that children under fourteen years of age should be allowed to work in the field. Is this not detrimental to their health—the hot sun, the early and the late dews and the rough bolls on the cotton stalks coming in contact with their tender fingers? Ought there not to be some protection for these innocent little ones? Why should not the several bureaus, which have been organized by sympathetic people for the regulation of child labor in the mills and factories, turn their attention to the miserable estate of the little folk employed in hard farm work in different parts of the country? Why not have the Government to intervene in their behalf, so as to save them from their inconsiderate parents? It will be said, of course, that it is not so bad for the children to be in the open air, but surely the Government should prescribe rules and regulations for the management of the children on the farm.

We have no doubt that the Blackwell boys and girls entered upon their record-breaking performances with great zest, and that they do not feel that they have been treated badly. But nowadays it is the habit of the Government to regulate all our domestic incomings and outgoings, and it would appear that this South Carolina cotton-picking contest might open another field for the exploitation of the tender-hearted and distressed.

WEDDING FEES.

The best thought of to-day demands that more rigid requirements shall be met by people wishing to enter the state of matrimony than are now imposed. Master students of the divorce problem tell us that such a raising of the standard of requirements is the only rational solution to be applied to the question of a rapidly increasing divorce rate in this country. Among the propositions advanced by these investigators into a problem that strikes at the foundations of our social life are that higher age limits should be required uniformly throughout the country, and that extended notice before the ceremony be made prerequisite to the issuance of a license. It seems to us in line with such a policy to suggest that the marriage license fee be made higher and that the fee paid to the minister performing the ceremony be made substantially greater. Of course, we know that the fee paid the minister is paid voluntarily, but it seems to us only logical that the minister should get more than the representative of temporal authority. Custom and conventionality can regulate this.

The trouble is, especially in this part of the nation, that wedding fees given to the minister are too small. In New York $50 and $100 are often paid without second thought. Oftentimes there are larger fees. One thousand dollars is frequently paid to the rector of a wealthy congregation performing this service. Larger fees are given in some cases. Wealthy men occasionally give a check for $2,000 or $3,000 to the clergyman, if he be well liked by the groom, who realizes that he could hardly make this gift in any other fashion. There are many clergymen in New York who get $1,200 the year in fees of this sort. A Presbyterian minister of a Broadway church estimates that his wedding fees amount annually to $1,000.

An American minister who officiated at the wedding of a wealthy parishioner in Paris some years ago received enough money to cover the expenses of a four months' sojourn in Europe.

In fact, we can conceive of no argument why a minister should not receive a liberal fee from the groom in all cases. Surely there is no happier moment in the groom's life, surely no service for which he could be more grateful, and a very large mite ought to fall to the share of the minister.

THIS ONE-MAN BUSINESS.

The Hampton Monitor says this week:

"This thing of a one-man business will not pay in any kind of an organization—lodge, church, athletics, club or what not. Men will not submit to being dominated and bossed around by one man. The Democrats had a Bryan party, and suffered defeat. The Republicans had smooth sailing for as long largely on this account. Now they have a leading soloist in Roosevelt, who is working destruction. We fear they have sense enough to get him out of the way."

The annals of the world bear out the fact that the dictator cannot stand, be his activity political, commercial, ecclesiastical or otherwise. The danger in the centralization of power in one man is that, having been made lord over a few things, he never ceases in his desire to become lord over all things.

The political sphere does not contain all the demagogues who seek personal advancement through dictatorship.

CORD WOOD.

A little bulletin has just been published by the United States Department of Agriculture concerning the use of cord wood for fuel. It points out that more than a third of the wood cut in this country is consumed in the farm house and in the open fireplaces of the smaller cities. Twenty billion cubic feet of timber are used annually and seven billion cubic feet of this amount is cord wood. Lumber and shingles alone explain more cutting of timber than the farm house and open fireplaces of the smaller cities. Lumber and shingles account for nine billion out of the twenty billion cubic feet yearly disposed of. In comparison with these two demands on the country's timber resources, the remaining items are small. Poles, posts and rails take two billion cubic feet, hewn cross-ties less than one and a half and all other items amount to only about half a billion cubic feet. The cord wood burned in the entire nation is estimated at 86,000,000 cords, valued at $250,000,000, or $2.91 a cord. The farms burn 70,000,000 cords, worth $182,700,000, or $2.61 a cord. Towns and cities containing not more than 30,000 inhabitants, take 12,615,000 cords, valued at $50,590,000, or $4.01 a cord. The remainder, less than 3,500,000 cords, is used by cities above 30,000 inhabitants and by mines, and costs the consumers nearly $17,000,000.

Tennessee leads all other States as a cord wood burning State. It uses 4,420,976 cords the year; North Carolina uses 4,043,460 cords; Alabama uses 4,123,100 cords; Georgia uses 4,212,960 cords. Other States using cord wood in large quantities are: Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia and Wisconsin. Their share ranges from 2,000,000 to nearly 4,000,000 cords each the year.

Cord wood is used more, generally speaking, south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi Rivers. The use of it is greater where transportation facilities are least in evidence, and where wood lots are ample. Where open fireplaces are used instead of stoves, the consumption is, of course, greater.

The Department of Agriculture, it should be noted, by no means condemns the use of wood for fuel. Some of the wood so used is not adapted to other purposes. Much of it is not marketable, for the reason that it is found in scattered wood lots remote from common carriers. Forestry by no means denies the demand for wood for fuel purposes.

Hoxsey fell a mile the other day in the airship races at Baltimore; but Hoxsey missed the opportunity of his life at St. Louis, and should be known in aeroplane history as the bird who had a chance to serve his country and wouldn't take it.

All the papers are talking about George Harvey's guess about the result of the elections in the pivotal States this year and how nearly he hit it. Says the Waterbury American: "Colonel Harvey is a wonder—this year." Colonel Harvey is a wonder every year, and the older he gets and the more guesses he makes the more wonderful he seems. It is now the intention of the Equal Suffrage people of Richmond to have him speak here before the season is over about the rights of women, and the hall will not be big enough to hold the people who will want to hear him.

The artillery got its raise after a long fight, and we are glad of it.

Are we to have a government by college professors? Champ Clark used to be one and Woodrow Wilson is another. Rah! Rah!

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

Meschianza.

Please print the meaning of the word "Meschianza," the ball given in Philadelphia during the Revolution. When was the ball given? E. P.

Trevelyan, in his "American Revolution," says "Meschianza" is an Italian word, meaning a medley. The festivity took place on May 18, 1778, and began with a grand regatta. This was followed by a tournament, at which two Queens of Beauty (one English and one American) presided, and six knights arrayed in crimson and white challenged and contended with six dressed in black and orange. In the evening there was a ball, with supper for 1,200 guests, while outside there was a grand display of fireworks, rockets, etc. The historian concludes the account with the dry remark that "this was the last gunpowder which General Howe saw fired in America."

Monuments to American Indians.

Are there any monuments in the United States erected to the American Indian chiefs, and if so, where? L. C.

In the United States there are a number of fine statues erected to American Indians, leading among which are the following:

Sakajawea, "the Mother of Oregon," at Portland.
Pocahontas, Jamestown Island.
Mahaska, recently erected in Iowa.
Red Jacket, in Buffalo.
Miantonomoh, in Boston.
Sleepy Eye, at Sleepy Eye, Minn.
Shabonee, at Morris, Ill.
Osceola, at Fort Moultrie, Charleston, S. C.
Tomochichi, in Savannah.
Uncas, at Norwich, Conn.
Pushmataha, in Washington, D. C.
Cornplanter, in Pennsylvania.
Cornstalk, at Point Pleasant, W. Va.
Logan, at Auburn, N. Y.
Keokuk, at Keokuk, Ia.
Attucks, in Boston Common.
Waban, at Newton, Mass.
Leatherlips, Franklin county, O.
Brant (Thayendanegea), at Brantford, Ontario.

The last named, who assumed the name of Joseph Brant, was the chief of the Six Nations.

Duche's Letter to Washington.

Please print main statements of the letter sent by the Rev. Jacob Duche, a former chaplain of the Continental Army, to General George Washington at Valley Forge in the dark days of the Revolution, 1777.

I mean the letter in which he tries to persuade Washington to become a traitor, like Benedict Arnold.

Give a brief sketch of his life and the church he was pastor of and where he is buried. E. B.

When the British took possession of Philadelphia Dr. Jacob Duche seemed to despair of the success of the patriotic cause, and wrote a letter to Washington, in October, 1777, urging him to abandon what he considered a forlorn hope, and to "represent to Congress the indispensable necessity of rescinding the hasty and ill-advised Declaration of Independence." Washington transmitted the letter to Congress, and it soon found its way into the newspapers. In consequence Dr. Duche left this country and went to England, where he soon made a reputation as an eloquent preacher. In the meantime his estates had been confiscated, and he himself declared a traitor. He returned to Philadelphia in 1790 in feeble health, and received no employment. He died in that city on January 3, 1798. He was rector of the United Churches of Philadelphia, Christ and St. Peter's, at the time the letter was written.

Duche was born in Philadelphia, in 1737, the son of a Huguenot who came to America with William Penn. He was educated at Philadelphia and at Cambridge, England. He was licensed in 1759 by the Bishop of London to officiate in the churches of Philadelphia. At the beginning of the Revolution he espoused the cause of the Colonies, and was invited to make the opening prayer on the assembling of the First Congress, September 7, 1774.

Address of Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Please answer through your Query Column the following questions:

1. Please give name and address of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of Virginia.
2. Is it dangerous to apple trees for cedars to grow near them? M.

1. Hon. J. W. Eggleston, State Capitol, Richmond.
2. Not that we know of.

PRINCE VICTOR TO WED WEALTHY PRINCESS

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

FRIDAY next is the date set for the wedding of Prince Victor Bonaparte to Princess Clementine of Belgium, at Moncalieri, the home of the bridegroom's mother, Princess Clothilde, in the neighborhood of Turin. Much speculation exists as to the fortune of the bride, which is estimated at between two and three millions of dollars, while on the death of her demented aunt, the Empress Charlotte of Mexico, she will doubtless receive a share of the latter's estate, the amount of which remains, for the present at any rate, a mystery. Its original figure stood in the neighborhood of eight millions of dollars, that is to say, at the time of her marriage to the ill-fated brother of the Emperor of Austria. But whether it was squandered by her brother, the late King Leopold, who persisted in retaining its management in his hands, declining to render any account, or whether it has gone on doubling itself again and again during the last half century no one except King Albert and the executors of his uncle's will have any knowledge.

Whatever Princess Clementine's fortune is, however, it will prove a perfect godsend to Prince Victor, who has suffered for years past from very straitened circumstances. It is true that he receives an allowance from Empress Eugenie, but it is by no means large, and somewhat grudgingly paid, for Eugenie, who was so extravagant when on the throne, has become extremely economical in her old age. Princess Mathilde's fortune, which was small, went partly to her morganatic husband and partly to Prince Victor's younger brother, Prince Louis, who also inherited the whole of his father's property, Victor being disinherited, and receiving nothing but his father's dying curse, on account of his unfilial conduct. Victor has also been receiving a small allowance from his mother, Princess Clothilde, but he has experienced great difficulty in making both ends meet, and in living, not as a prince of the blood, but even as a mere gentleman of leisure, it being doubtful whether his total income has ever exceeded $12,000 a year, if indeed as much.

It has been expected that Prince Louis would have helped him; but unfortunately Louis, though exceedingly loyal to his elder brother, and turning a deaf ear to all the offers made to him of the chieftaincy of the Bonapartist party and of the role of Imperialist Pretender, developed a craze for gambling, which rendered it completely out of his power to assist Victor; in fact, landed him in such embarrassments as to cause him to forfeit the good will of the Czar and of the imperial family of Russia, by whom he was formerly treated as a near and dear relative, invested as he was with the rank of general of Russian cavalry, and with the Order of St. Andrew.

It is this impecuniosity of Prince Victor that has rendered him so harmless as a pretender, since he has had no money whatsoever to make it possible for him to subsidize any organs of the French press, or to employ paid agents of his cause. Whether Princess Clementine's money will be used for the organization of a Bonapartist propaganda in France in favor of the restoration of the Napoleonic empire remains to be seen. It was the fear of something of the kind that led King Leopold, who in spite of his faults was a very astute politician, to withhold his consent to the marriage. Prince Victor, by the by, dislikes to be known by that Christian name, which he owes to the fact that he is a grandson of the late King Victor Emmanuel, and insists on being styled "Prince Napoleon."

Nowhere have I seen mentioned the fact that Luccheni, the assassin of Empress Elizabeth, who committed suicide a couple of weeks ago in his prison at Geneva, attempted some years back to murder M. Purrin, the governor of the jail, with the same species of weapon as that which he had used to kill the consort of Emperor Francis Joseph, namely, a small file which he had sharpened to an extremely fine point, by rubbing it on the stone floor of his cell. In fact, his frequent attacks upon the governor and warders are said to have hastened the premature death of the former, by keeping him in a constant state of anxiety.

It will naturally be asked how so dangerous a prisoner happened to have a file in his possession. The explanation is to be found in the fact that he was employed in the bookbindery department of the institution, and that he had managed to secrete one of the tools. It was one of his more than ordinarily violent attacks upon his warders in the bookbindery department—an attack which required six men to overpower him—that led to his being placed in the solitary confinement punishment cell, in the basement of the penitentiary; and it was there that he managed to strangle himself by means of his leather belt.

To the number of those many pretenders who claim to be descended from Louis XVII. of France, that is to say, from the missing Dauphin, after his alleged escape from the Temple prison, must be added the name of the Armenian banker, Nazareth Allahverdi, a leading banker at Constantinople, who has taken an important part in the negotiations which have resulted in the acquisition by the Ottoman government of a $60,000,000 loan, under onerous conditions, from a syndicate of German bankers, after the loan had been declined in France, England and Holland owing to the refusal of the French government to admit it to official quotation on the Paris Bourse.

It seems that in the third year of the first republic an Armenian of the name of Duz Zahde, who had been dispatched by the Sultan to Paris to study the methods of minting coin, was intrusted by Cambaceres, subsequently consul of the republic, and later on Arch-Chancellor of the Empire, with the care of a boy whose parents had been guillotined during the Terror. Cambaceres declares that the boy's father had been a very great personage indeed, and that he died on the scaffold so thoroughly embittered against his own country that he had expressed the wish that his child should divest himself, both of his French nationality and of his Christian religion.

Duz Zahde took the boy back with him to Constantinoule, refraining, however, from making a Moslem of him, and brought him up with his own children, as an Armenian Catholic, endowing him with the name of Allahverdi, which means "Given by God."

Many years afterwards Duz Zahde incurred the displeasure of the Padishah, and was bowstrung, whereupon his papers came into the hands of the French ambassador, who in his dispatches to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Paris, at the commencement of the reign of King Louis Philippe, that is to say, in the fourth decade of the last century, declared that they were of a nature to confirm his belief in the story to the effect that Allahverdi was no other than the Dauphin.

The French government paid no attention whatsoever to the dispatches about the matter from its envoy at Constantinople, being at the time confronted by stories of a similar character, not only from all parts of Europe, but even from the United States. In fact, between 1820 and 1840 there were scores of men who put forward pretensions to being the missing Dauphin. Not one of them, however, succeeded in ever establishing his claim.

The original Allahverdi lived and died at Constantinople, and Nazareth Allahverdi, the Stamboul financier and participant in the new German-Turkish loan, is undoubtedly the grandson of the boy confided by Cambaceres to the Armenian Duz Zahde at the close of the eighteenth century, and who, according to his own story, backed by the dispatches of the French envoy at Constantinople in 1834, preserved among the archives of the Minister of Foreign Affairs at Paris, is the great-grandson of the ill-fated Louis XVI., and of his equally unfortunate consort, Queen Marie Antoinette.